

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-38 were pending in this application. Of these, claims 5-7, 14, and 38 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-38 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 39-72 have been added to rewrite claims 1-4, 8-13, and 15-37 in order to conform to U.S. application practice. Support for claim 39 may be found, for example, in original claim 1, and paragraph [0103] of the published application. Support for the remaining claims 40-72 may be found, for example, in original claims 2-38. Thus, claims 39-72 are currently pending in this application. Claim 39 is independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 39. No new matter has been added.

**Objection(s) to the Abstract**

The abstract stands objected to for not being in narrative form. The abstract has been modified to conform to U.S. application practice as per the Examiner's instructions. Support for the abstract may be found, for example, in claims 39 and 48. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Objection(s) to the Specification**

The specification stands objected to for not having the preferred layout of a utility application. Section headings were added as per the Examiner's instructions. Additionally, typographical errors in the current specification were corrected. No new matter was added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Amendment to Drawings**

Fig. 2 has been replaced with a substitute figure to correct a typographical error in a reference number. No new matter has been added.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 8-13 and 15-37 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) for being in improper form owing to a multiple dependent claim depending from another multiple dependent claim. Claims 1-4 stand objected to for not conforming to U.S. application practice. Claims 1-4, 8-13, and 15-37 were canceled, thereby rendering these objections moot. These claims were rewritten as claims 39-72 to conform to U.S. application practice as per the Examiner's instructions. Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-4, 8-13 and 15-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4, 8-13, and 15-37 were canceled, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

These claims were rewritten as claims 39-72 with distinct subject matter, *viz.* a connector for connecting a windshield wiper arm to a first transverse hinge pin belonging to a structure element of a wiper blade unit. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WIPO Publication No. WO 01/15946 ("Robert Bosch"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the new claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

One of the goals of the present invention is to use a connector adapted to various pin sizes (*see, e.g.,* paragraph [0012] of published application). When a pin 62 of a size larger than a first size is received in the second recess 84 of the connector 36, the film of material 90 breaks to enable the locking tongue 86 to deform to a large extent (*see* paragraph [0137] and Fig. 2A). Accordingly, independent claim 39 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein a second longitudinal end of the locking tongue is normally connected to the body by a film of material, and the dimensions of the film are determined so that the second recess is suitable for receiving the second transverse pin of a first or of a second size, the second size being greater than the first size, and inserting the second transverse pin of the second size causes the film of material to break."

The Examiner construes element 48 in Fig. 4 and Fig. 8 of Robert Bosch to structurally and functionally equate to the film of material as required by independent claim 39. Element 48 is a "pressure surface." It serves as the end of the flap element 45 that serves to reduce the diameter of the second recess 43. Fig. 8 clearly shows that element 48 would lie outside the

second pin 24 in a connected state inside second recess 43. Inserting the second pin 24 into the second recess would cause the flap element 45 to be pushed downwards until the second pin 24 finds the right position, after which the flap element 45 snaps back up so that the arm 11 is locked in place. The element 48, on a top portion of the connector (*see* Figs. 4 and 8), would therefore would not break when a pin 24 of a second greater size is inserted into the second recess 43. Also, the breaking of element 48 when such a pin is inserted would actually be detrimental to the functioning of element 45.


Thus, Robert Bosch does not show or suggest "wherein a second longitudinal end of the locking tongue is normally connected to the body by a film of material and the dimensions of the film are determined so that the second recess is suitable for receiving the second transverse pin of a first or of a second size, the second size being greater than the first size, and inserting the second transverse pin of the second size causes the film of material to break" as required by independent claim 39. Robert Bosch, therefore, does not show or suggest at least this limitation of claim 39. Consequently, claim 39 is not anticipated by Robert Bosch. The remaining claims, directly or indirectly dependent on claim 39, are also not anticipated for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 17102/018001).

Dated: May 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By  *by J.P. Osha*  
Jonathan P. Osha *THOMAS SCHUBERT*  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Replacement Drawing (1 sheet; 1 figure)